

**CMER Meeting
April 17, 2003
NWIFC Conference Center
Minutes**

Attendees:

Butts, Sally	USFWS
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Cramer, Darin	DNR, Federal Assurances
Ehinger, Bill	DOE
Engle, Mark	DNR Board Manual Coordinator
Glass, Domoni	Glass Environmental
Green, Matthew	DOE
Hansen, Craig	USFWS
Harlow, Eric	WFLC
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
Lippke, Bruce	University of Washington
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER Co-Chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McDonald, Dennis	DNR
McFadden, George	NWIFC
McNaughton, Geoff	DNR
Peterson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Prater, Brian	Campbell Group
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	WDFW; CMER Co-Chair
Raines, Mary	NWIFC
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely
Robinson, Tom	WSAOC
Roorbach, Ash	NWIFC
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC
Smitch, Curt	Thompson Group
Stringer, Angela	Campbell Group

Approve Minutes and Review Actions:

Minutes from the March CMER meeting were approved as amended. Action items were reviewed as follows:

- A comprehensive projects list is out for comment to the SAGs now and project managers are being identified
- CMER Research Waiver: Letter delivered to Policy and subcommittee formed.

- Intensive and extensive monitoring will be discussed at the May CMER meeting
- Handbook Committee workshop: cancelled and chapter 6 not ready for distribution yet

Summary of Decisions and Tasks

Decision/Task	Section of Minutes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground Rules Approved with amendments • Meeting Management Training recommended. Protocols and Standards Manual Work Group to formulate options. 	SAG Requests
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • McNaughton will request a compliance monitoring report for May CMER meeting • McNaughton will request a written list of rule tool priorities 	Rule Tools Update
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAGs are asked to revise their parts of the workplan by May 1st, Schuett-Hames will then forward the plan out to CMER in preparation for the May CMER meeting. The MDT will be made available again for review. • Decisions about extensive and intensive monitoring have not been made at this time and we should decide at the May meeting how to proceed with this. 	Workplan Update
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAGs were asked not to focus on intensive monitoring projects yet. • SAGs were asked to work on extensive and effectiveness monitoring projects. • UPSAG was asked to discuss whether extensive monitoring of mass wasting is the appropriate pathway, and if so work on the scope of work. 	Policy issues
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quinn and Martin will have a formal proposal for CMER at the June meeting. • McNaughton, Quinn, and Martin were asked to head a committee, to work on an annual science review conference, with support from the SAG co-chairs and Rowton. • Any SAG that is currently considering contracting should include in their scope of work a provision requiring contractors to make a presentation. • Individuals are asked to-forward suggestions for presentations to Martin and Quinn. 	Annual Science Review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAGs are asked to contact McNaughton with staff needs. The AMPA, CMER Co-Chairs, and a SAG Co-chair will then meet to discuss the needs. Issues and conflicts that may arise will be reported back to CMER at the May meeting. 	CMER Staff

Budget Update: Bull trout funding has been clarified in the current version of the Budget. Schuett-Hames estimated CMER staff at \$365,000 for next year's staffing. That expense is not reflected in this budget sheet but is a funding item. There is an internal DNR rule stating that raises and increased travel costs, cannot be reflected in this year's budget when they are for next year.

SAG Requests:

PSMWG: CMER ground rules were proposed as final. There was discussion around ground rule B, bullet 8 "conversation manager". Raines explained that during each discussion, CMER should appoint a conversation manager to facilitate the discussion. Managing conversations ensure that the conversations will stay on track and that questions will be answered and the discussion resolved constructively. This bullet was revised as reflected in the attached ground rules. McFadden noted a concern with ground rule E which relates to contractors, and suggested that we may want to limit the roles that potential contractors play in the SAG. Schuett-Hames clarified that there are many decisions that take place before the drafting of an RFP, SOW, etc. and if potential contractors are involved in those discussions it may hurt CMER credibility. However, many times, contractors will actually write the SOW as part of their contract. This ground rule was revised as reflected in the attached ground rules. McDonald noted that we should take cognizance of the fact that adopting these ground rules is a serious and important step and that we will be bound by these rules - each CMER participant is responsible for operating under these ground rules and helping others to adhere to those ground rules as well.

CMER Consensus: ground rules approved as amended.

CMER Consensus: CMER Committee members re-committed to "group meeting management training" in the form of a workshop. Quinn suggested that the PSMWG craft a formal proposal for this training and formulate options for different meeting lengths.

SRC Update: McNaughton said that the contract will be signed Tuesday. Two Watertyping projects, a WETSAG literature review, the DFC project and the Joan Sias report are all scheduled for review at this time.

Rule Tools Update: CMER requested a compliance monitoring progress report. Sturhan has agreed to provide a written list of priorities to CMER. McNaughton will follow-up on both issues will be the discussion leader for the next meeting.

Workplan Update: Schuett-Hames said that SAG co-chairs have a document to begin working with. CMER staff has added, reformatted, and reorganized information and have added budget estimates for the projects and programs that were received in February.

This document was sent to SAG co-chairs with the hopes that they would look through rule tools and programs in their areas and provide comments to Staff. Schuett-Hames would like this feedback by May 1st so changes can be incorporated and sent to CMER for consideration during the May meeting.

The workplan, intensive monitoring, and extensive monitoring will be discussed at the May CMER meeting. There was discussion surrounding how extensive monitoring projects should be handled within CMER, and concern was expressed regarding the workload associated with these projects and how needed expertise can be delegated to the projects. Pleus said that there was never CMER agreement about the budget, projects or method for completion for intensive, extensive or compliance monitoring. He would like to have this discussed at the May meeting.

Quinn said that we need to hear, from SAGs, at the next meeting, how SAGs will engage in extensive monitoring and intensive monitoring. Clark added that we need to this monitoring, we have people at CMER to respond to these needs, and we need to decide how we will handle extensive and intensive monitoring. Raines said that clarifying what we mean by “extensive” and “intensive” monitoring would help people. Quinn said that there is clarification in the MDT report.

Pleus asked if Schuett-Hames could send the workplan to all CMER participants for review. The report will be sent to CMER participants in May when the SAG input has been added. Rowton will post the MDT Report on the WFPA website and will send the link to CMER.

Assignments: SAG co-chairs are to revise their parts of the workplan by May 1st, Schuett-Hames will then forward the plan out to CMER in preparation for the May CMER meeting. The MDT Report will be made available again for review. Decisions about extensive and intensive monitoring have not been made at this time and we should decide at the May meeting how to proceed with this.

Summary of Policy issues related to April 8th Policy Meeting:

The two big issues that CMER approached policy with were the research waiver and the project recommendations. The research waiver will require more work and policy formed a subcommittee to craft recommendations for a solution to this issue. The subcommittee will meet next week.

Smitch clarified that the intent of the FFR Report and rules devised on its basis was that research would be permissible. The question is how you do that the way that the rule is currently worded. Since there is much litigation at this time, the easiest challenge to FFR derived rules is a procedural challenge. The subcommittee solution must honor the intent of the agreement without violating legal principles. Policy conveyed this importance of this research waiver and asked the committee to formulate options quickly.

The second issue was approval of CMER projects. Quinn said that policy would like CMER to get major priorities up and running quickly. Policy wants CMER to facilitate this process so that budget decisions can be more informed. Compliance monitoring has raised this issue again – it is currently unfunded in DNR. The LHZ project is also a budget issue; it's very expensive (\$2.2 million) and it is unclear to policy how much added value they were getting relative to less expensive alternatives to this project. Policy specifically wonders if the LHZ project can be phased in rather than done all at once. There is a subcommittee of Policy meeting next week to discuss these budget issues. Smitch said that when CMER brings budget items to policy for recommendations, they would like accompanying background information before the meeting.

Raines said she was concerned that a group of people will be discussing the LHZ and they will not have proper context for this discussion. Raines suggested that Dieu, Raines, Vaugeois, or Sturhan attend the budget subcommittee meeting to answer technical questions.

Quinn added that policy has recognized the need for funding in out-years and has approached both the Federal government and State government with this need.

McNaughton said that the policy committee did discuss the concern with funding delays and reaffirmed the position that the FPB is the ultimate authority and they meet quarterly to discuss this. CMER needs to work within that schedule. The FFR Policy also suggested that CMER bring projects to the FPB in November for approval so that they are pre-approved before field seasons hit in subsequent years. Pleus said that the project development fund was also brought up as a possibility to use for emergency projects.

Assignments to SAGs:

Don't worry about intensive monitoring yet. Work on extensive and effectiveness monitoring projects. UPSAG was asked to discuss whether extensive monitoring of mass wasting is the appropriate pathway, and if so work on the scope of work. Martin clarified that roads projects are UPSAGs highest priority.

CMER Annual Science Review: Martin suggested a forum to show CMER results in the form of an annual science review, formally presented, in a nice setting. He would like to target this winter (January, February, March) for the first session. CMER can fill at least one day, possibly two. Pucci said that this is a good idea and she is glad to hear it again. McNaughton said that CMER is required to do a biennial performance audit and this may fit into that process. McConnell also agreed that this is a good idea and asked if it would be open for related projects as well. Hansen asked if we would focus on results or project status to date. Quinn thought the first focus should be results but talking about status and conceptual approaches would also be helpful.

CMER Consensus: McNaughton, Quinn, and Martin should head a committee with support from the SAG co-chairs and Rowton. Quinn and Martin will have a formal

proposal for CMER at the June meeting. Any SAG that is currently considering contracting should include in their scope of work, a provision requiring contractors to make a presentation. Individuals are asked to forward suggestions for presentations to Martin and Quinn.

McNaughton updated that he had been to a conference with the BC Ministry of Forests to talk about adaptive management. They are revising their forest management rules to be based on results and they need an effectiveness monitoring program developed within one year. They are actively seeking input from others.

SAG Issues: no SAG issues were reported.

CMER Staff Assignments: McNaughton said that he received a CMER staff time request from UPSAG for Palmquist's time. Raines said that there is more work on the list than one person can do and they need this work completed within the next 9-12 months. UPSAG wants, not only Palmquist's time, but also another staff person. UPSAG is also wondering if CMER can contract, through an interagency agreement, to get another person who might otherwise be laid off.

Glass said that there are other SAGs that would also like expertise. Schuett-Hames suggested the appropriate way to handle this is to submit a request to McNaughton. Quinn suggested that co-chairs from SAGs sit down with the CMER co-chairs and McNaughton to discuss staffing needs. This group will then come forward with a recommendation.

Assignment: contact McNaughton with staff needs within one week. The committee will report back to CMER at the May meeting.

Next Agenda, science topic: workplan, extensive and intensive monitoring discussion, and staffing reports from subcommittees.